(MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN)

So far as the Appropriation Bill is concerned, as the hon. Members are aware, it is a money Bill and this was placed before this House on and September. Within 14 days we have to pass that Bill. Unless and until the hon. Members convince the Chair that there is sufficient ground for variation of the business of the House, we may carry on the legislative business as per the list of business.

Hydarabad Jagirs (Commutation) Regulation (Mysore Amendment) Bill 1967.

(As passed by the Legislative Assembly)

Motion to Consider

Sri H. V. KOUJALGI (Minister for Revenue) I beg to move :—

"That the Hyderabad Jagirs (Commutation) Regulation (Mysore Amendment) Bill, 1967, as passed by the Legislative Assembly, be taken into consideration."

Mr. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN.—Motion moved :

"That the Hyderabad Jagirs (Commutation) Regulation (Mysore Amendment) Bill, 1967 as passed by the Legislative Assembly, be taken into consideration."

Sri H. V. KOUJALGI.—Sir, this is a Bill Seeking to amend the Hyderabad Jagirs Regulation No. 25 of 1951. This was a legislation passed by the then Hyderabad State in the year 1951. After integration some of the districts, *i.e.*, Gulbarga, Bidar and Raichur have been merged with the Mysore State and so this Hyderabad Jagirs Regulation is in force in this State. It affects these three districts only. In the working of this regulation, some difficulties have been experienced. To remove those difficulties this amending Bill has been brought before this House. I may submit Sir, these amendments are more or less procedural and very formal.

In the first amendment in Section 4, some amendments are sought to be made. The main object of this regulation was to abolish the Jagirs in the old Hyderabad districts. When these Jagirs were to be abolished, some compensation amount had to be paid by the Government to the Jagirdars. These Jagirdars were paying only some allowances to the Government. These allowances are called hissa, sarkar, chowth, makasa, dharpatti etc. According to this regulation, these have all been abolished. The first amendment provides how the basic amount has to be calcuated. It is more or less a procedural one. The provisions of the Act were not so clear in this respect. There was some difficulty in implementing those provisions. Therefore it was

found that some amendment was necessary. The average annual revenue will be taken into consideration for the purposes of calculation instead of the gross basic sum.

Now I come to the second amendment. Sir, the Jagirdars were expected to pay some allowance to the Nawab on account of hissa, sarkar, chowth Makasa, dharpatti etc. While commuting the Jagir what the Jagirdars used to pay to the Navab was deducted and the balance was paid to the Jagirdars. The Andhra High Court has held in a case filed in that Court that we cannot make such deductions when the Act is not very clear on that point and the provisions of that Act were set aside. What we have done is we have deducted all the amount that was due to the Navab and the balance was paid. Now, as per the direction of the High Court, we will have to refund the entire amount if the law stands as it is. We have to make provision that what we have deducted is rightly deducted and that it is not returnable. That provision is made now. In Andhra State also, such an amendment has been brought. In section 5, suppose while paying this commutation amount to the Jagirdar, if he receives an amount less than what is due to him, he has a remedy to go in appeal. But if on the other hand, the administrator inadvertantly or for any other reason makes an over-payment, more than what is due; Government has no remedy now under the existing Act. By this amendment, provision has been made for Government also to go in appeal if any amount has been paid in excess of what is due.

3-30 P.M.

Secondly, by way of an interim arrangement, sometimes these commutation amounts are also paid and after some time as a result of new evidence if it comes to the notice of the Government that the amount paid is excessive, there is no remedy to get back the money or to recover. So, that remedy is also provided in this amendment.

Thirdly, these being old jagirs, sufficient evidence was not coming forward when these commutations were settled and now it has come to light through some reliable evidence or through some document. In such a case, if the Administrator is satisfied, he can re-open the matter and take into consideration the new evidence that has come into light and if he is satisfied after re-opening there is any case, he can reduce the commutation. In some cases, Sir, he can revise these matters on an application or even suo motu.

Sri G. V. ANJANAPPA.—In Hyderabad they may call it as jagir commutation regulation. In Mysore, they may call it inam abolition. Similar problems exist in Mysore State also.

Sri H. V. KOUJALGI.—With due respect to my friend, his suggestion could have been considered if we are legislating a new enactment. Here the Act is already there and it has been implemented in

(SRI H. V. KOUJALGI)

Mysore State since 1956. Because we are experiencing some difficulties in implementing the provisions of the Act, we wanted to remove those difficulties and therefore an amendment Bill has been brought. We are not making a new legislation. Those practices, which are there in ex-Hyderabad districts, do not exist in other areas of the State and therefore I can understand the difficulty of the hon. Member in appreciating the provisions. I have consulted the Law Department and they have said that these amendments are necessary. Lastly in section 10, some amount was given as allowance to educational, chartiable institutions and in some cases to individuals. How these are to be paid and in what proportion they are to be paid is provided in the amendment of section 10 and insertion of Section 10-A.

These are formal amendments and merely procedural in order to remedy certain difficulties felt in the implementation of this Bill. This Bill will have effect only in those districts of the former Hyderabad State. Such amendments are carried out in Andhra Pradesh also which containes a major portion of the districts of old Hyderabad State.

I request the House to kindly accept this Bill and pass it.

† ಶ್ರೀ ಜಿ. ವಿ. ಆಂಜನಪ್ಪ.—ಇದೊಂದು ವಿಚಿತ್ರವಾದ ಪರಿಸ್ಥಿತಿ. ಈ ಮಸೂದೆಯಲ್ಲರುವುದೇನು ಎಂದು ತಿಳಿದುಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಬಹಳ ಪ್ರಯತ್ನಪಟ್ಟೆ, ಅರ್ಥವಾಗಲಲ್ಲ. ಆದರೂ ಭಾಷಣ ಮಾಡಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ. ಈ ಸಂದರ್ಭದಲ್ಲಿ ಸರಕಾರಕ್ಕೆ ತಿಳಿದಿರುವುದಿಷ್ಟೆ : ಹಳೆಯ ಮೈಸೂರಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಇನಾಂ ಅಬಾಲಿಷನ್ ಬಿಲ್ ಇದೆ. ಎಲ್ಲವನ್ನೂ ಒಟ್ಟಿಗೆ ಸೇರಿಸಿ ಹೈದರಾಬಾದು ಕರ್ನಾಟಕ-ಮುಂಬಯಿ ಪ್ರದೇಶ ಮುಂತಾದ ಎಲ್ಲ ಭಾಗಗಳನ್ನು ಸೇರಿಸಿ ಸಮಗ್ರವಾದ ಒಂದು ಕಾನೂನನ್ನು ತಂದಿದ್ದರೆ ಚೆನ್ನಾಗಿತ್ತು. ಇಂದು ಹೈದರಾಬಾದು ಪ್ರದೇಶಕ್ಕೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟಹಾಗೆ ಅಲ್ಲಿ 51ನೆಯ ಇಸವಿಯ ಹೈದರಾಬಾದು ರೆಗ್ಯುಲೇಷನ್ ಜಾರಿಯಲ್ಲಿದೆಯೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿದರು. ಮುಂಬಯಿ ಪ್ರದೇಶದಲ್ಲರುವ ಕಾನೂನು ಮತ್ತು ಹಳೇ ಮೈಸೂರಿನಲ್ಲರುವ ಕಾನೂನು ಇವನ್ನೆಲ್ಲಾ ಸೇರಿಸಿ ಕ್ರೋಡೀಕರಿಸಿ ಇನಾಂ ಅಬಾಲಿಷನ್ ಮತ್ತು ಜಹಗೀರ್ ಅಬಾಲಿಷನ್ ಆದರೆ ಕಾಂಪೆನ್ಸೇಷನ್ ಯಾವರೀತಿ ಕೊಡಬೇಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆ ಎಂದು ತಿಳಿಸುವ ಒಂದು ಸಮಗ್ರವಾದ ಮಸೂದೆಯನ್ನು ತಂದಿದ್ದರೆ ಕಷ್ಟವಿರುತ್ತಿರಲಲ್ಲ. ಆ ಪ್ರದೇಶದಲ್ಲರುವ ಕಾನೂನು ನನಗೆ ಅರ್ಥವಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಅದನ್ನು ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳು ಅರ್ಥಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡು ಯಾವರೀತಿ ಕಾರ್ಯಕ್ರಮ ಕೈಗೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತಾರೋ ತಿಳಿಯದು. ಆದುದರಿಂದ ಈ ಬಿಲ್ಲಿನ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲೇನು ಮಾತನಾಡಬೇಕೋ ತಿಳಿಯದು. ಮುಂದಾದರೂ ಇಡೀ ರಾಜ್ಯಕ್ಕೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟಹಾಗೆ ಸಮಗ್ರವಾದ ಮಸೂದೆಯನ್ನು ತರಬೇಕೆಂದು ಸೂಚಿಸುತ್ತೇನೆ.

† ಶ್ರೀ ಸಿ. ಬಂದೀಗೌಡ (ಉಪಾಧ್ಯಾಯರ ಕ್ಷೇತ್ರ) —ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸಭಾಪತಿಗಳೇ, ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ಆಂಜನಪ್ಪನವರು ಮಾತನಾಡುವಾಗ ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟ ಹಾಗೆ ಇಡೀ ರಾಜ್ಯಕ್ಕೆ ಅನ್ವಯವಾಗುವ ಒಂದು ಮಸೂದೆ ತರಬೇಕು ಎಂದು ಸೂಚಿಸಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಹೈದರಾಬಾದ್ ಕರ್ನಾಟಕದಲ್ಲರುವ ವಿಶೇಷ ಮಸೂದೆಯನ್ನು ಈ ರಾಜ್ಯಕ್ಕೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟಹಾಗೆ ತರುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಾಧ್ಯವೇ ಇಲ್ಲ, ಅದರ ಅಗತ್ಯವೂ ಇಲ್ಲ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಜಿ. ವಿ. ಆಂಜನಪ್ಪ.—ನಾನು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದು ಜಹಗೀರು ಮತ್ತು ಇನಾಂ ಅಬಾಲಿಷನ್ ಇವುಗಳಿಗೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟ ಮಸೂದೆಗಳಿರಡೂ ಒಂದೇ ರೀತಿಯ ಮಸೂದೆಗಳು. ಆದುದರಿಂದ ಸಮಗ್ರವಾದ ಮಸೂದೆ ತರಬಹುದಾಗಿತ್ತು ಎಂದು. ಆದರೆ ಶ್ರೀ ಬಂದೀಗೌಡರು ಹಳೇ ಮೈಸೂರಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಈ ಸಂಬಂಧವಾದ ಮಸೂದೆಯೇ ಇಲ್ಲ ಎಂದರೆ ಎಷ್ಟುಮಟ್ಟಿಗೆ ಅದು ನಿಜ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುವುದಕ್ಕಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಸಿ. ಬಂದೀಗೌಡ.—ಇದು ನಿಜ; ನೆರಿ ಮಾತಲ್ಲ. ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸಚಿವರಿ ಭಾಷಣದಿಂದ ಎರಡು ಸಂಗತಿಗಳು ಬೆಳಕಿಗೆ ಬಂದಿದೆ. ಮೊದಲನೆಯದಾಗಿ ಹಿಂದಿನ ಹೈದರಾಬಾದು ಪ್ರದೇಶದಲ್ಲಿ ಜಾಗೀರ್‌ದಾರರಿಗೆಷ್ಟು ಪರಿಹಾರ ಕೊಡಬೇಕು ಎಂದು ಗೊತ್ತುಮಾಡುವುದು ಕಷ್ಟವಾಗಿದೆ. ಎರಡನೆಯದು ಹೀಗೆ ಪರಿಹಾರವನ್ನು ಲೆಕ್ಕ ಮಾಡುವಾಗ ಎಷ್ಟೋವೇಳೆ ಎಷ್ಟು ಕೊಡಬೇಕೋ ಅದಕ್ಕಿಂತ ಹೆಚ್ಚು ಕೊಡಲಾಗಿದೆ. ಜಹಗೀರ್‌ದಾರರಿಗೆ ಕಡಿಮೆ ಪರಿಹಾರ ಕೊಡೆತಿದ್ದರೆ ಅಪೀಲು ಮಾಡಲು ಅವಕಾಶವಿದೆ; ಸರಕಾರಕ್ಕೆ ಅಧಿಕಾರವಿಲ್ಲ. ಆದುದರಿಂದ ಸರಕಾರದವರಿಗೆ ಅಂಥ ಅವಕಾಶ ಸಿಕ್ಕುವಹಾಗೆ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿ ತರಲಾಗಿದೆ ಎಂದು ತಿಳಿಸಿದರು. ಜಾಗೀರ್‌ದಾರರಿಗೂ ಸರಕಾರದವರಿಗೂ ಒಂದು ಮುಖ್ಯವಾದ ವೈತ್ಯಾಸವಿದೆ. ಸರಕಾರದವರು ತಮ್ಮ ಸ್ವಂತ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳನ್ನು ನೇಮಕಮಾಡಿರುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಸರಿಯಾದ ರೀತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಲೆಕ್ಕಮಾಡಿ ಎಷ್ಟು ಕೊಡಬೇಕೋ ಅಷ್ಟನ್ನು ಕೊಡಬೇಕು, ಇದು ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳ ಹೊಣೆ. ಕೊಡಬೇಕಾದ್ದಕ್ಕಿಂತ ಹೆಚ್ಚಾಗಿ ಕೆಲವು ಆಫೀಸರುಗಳು ಕೊಟ್ಟರೆ ಆ ಹೊಣೆಯನ್ನು ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳು ಹೊತ್ತುಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಯಾರೋ ಒಬ್ಬ ಬಡಪಾಯಿ ಐದಾರು ವರ್ಷಗಳ ಹಿಂದೆ ಪರಿಹಾರ ಇಷ್ಟು ಬರಬೇಕೆಂದು ತೆಗೆದು ಕೊಂಡು ಖರ್ಚುಮಾಡಿದ್ದರೆ ನಾಲ್ಕೈದು ವರ್ಷವಾದ ಮೇಲೆ ಹತ್ತು ಸಾವಿರ ರೂಪಾಯಿ ಜಾಸ್ತಿ ಕೊಟ್ಟರೆ, ಹರ್ಷಕ್ಕೆ ಎರಡು ಸಾವಿರ ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳಂತೆ ಕೊಡಬೇಕು ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದರೆ ಗತಿಯೇನು? ಆತ ಹೇಗೆ ಕೊಡುವುದು? ಇದನ್ನು ಸರಕಾರದವರು ಪರ್ಯಾಲೋಚನೆ ಮಾಡ ಬೇಕು. ಆದಷ್ಟು ಬಹಳ ವಿತರಣೆಯಿಂದ ಕೆಲಸ ನಡೆಸಬೇಕು. ಒಂದುವೇಳೆ ಅಚಾತುರ್ಯದಿಂದ ಜಹಗೀರುದಾರರಿಗೆ ಹೆಚ್ಚು ಪರಿಹಾರ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದರೆ ಅವರಿಂದ ವಾಪಸು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕಾಗಿ ಬಂದ ಸಂದರ್ಭದಲ್ಲಿ ಅಂದಿನ ಅವರ ಆರ್ಥಿಕ ಪರಿಸ್ಥಿತಿ ಹೇಗಿದೆಯೆಂಬುದನ್ನು ಗಮನಿಸದೆ ವಸೂಲು ಮಾಡುವುದು ಸಾಮಾಜಿಕ ನ್ಯಾಯವಲ್ಲ.

†ಶ್ರೀ ಡಿ. ರಾಜಗೋಪಾಲ್ (ವಿಧಾನ ಸಭಾಕ್ಷೇತ್ರ).—ಶ್ರೀ ಪಾಟೀಲ್ ಆಂಜನಪ್ಪನವರು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದರಲ್ಲಿ ಸ್ವಲ್ಪ ನಿಜಾಂಶ, ಸತ್ಯ ಇದೆ. ಈಗ ಜಾರಿಯಲ್ಲಿರತಕ್ಕ ನಾನಾ ಕಾನೂನುಗಳನ್ನೆಲ್ಲಾ ಸೇರಿಸಿ ಒಂದೇ ಒಂದು ಕಾನೂನು ಇಡೀ ಮೈಸೂರು ಸಂಸ್ಥಾನಕ್ಕೆ ಅನುಕೂಲವಾಗುವಂತೆ ತರಬೇಕೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿದರು, ಅದು ನಿಜ, ಅದನ್ನು ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಮಾಡಲೇಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ. ಎರಡನೆಯದು ಮೈಸೂರು ರಾಜ್ಯ ಇಂಟಗ್ರೇಟ್ ಆಗಿ 13 ವರ್ಷವಾದರೂ ಇವತ್ತಿಗೂ ಕೂಡ ಹೈದ್ರಾಬಾದು ಜಾಗೀರ್ ರೆಗ್ಯುಲೇಷನ್ ಅಂಡ್ ಕಮ್ಯೂಟೇಷನ್ ಆಕ್ಟ್ ಅಂತ ಓದಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ. ಒಂದು ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಯನ್ನು ತಂದು ಇದನ್ನೆಲ್ಲಾ ಸೇರಿಸಿ ಮೈಸೂರು ಜಾಗೀರ್ ರೆಗ್ಯುಲೇಷನ್ ಅಂಡ್ ಕಮ್ಯೂಟೇಷನ್ ಆಕ್ಟ್ ಅಂತ ಬದಲಾವಣೆ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದೇವೆ ಅಂತ ಹೇಳಬಹುದಾಗಿತ್ತು. ಈ ಕಡೆಗೆ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಗಮನ ಕೊಡದೇ ನಮ್ಮ ನಮ್ಮಲ್ಲೇ ಒಂದು ಪ್ರತ್ಯೇಕತೆಯ ಭಾವನೆ ಮೂಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಸಿ. ಬಂದೀಗೌಡ.—ಈ ಜಾಗೀರುಗಳಿಗೆ ಒಂದೊಂದು ಪ್ರದೇಶದಲ್ಲಿ ಒಂದೊಂದು ಅರ್ಥ ವಿದೆ. ಮನುಷ್ಯ ಎಂದರೆ ಎಲ್ಲರೂ ಒಂದೇ ಅಂತ ಹೇಳುವಹಾಗೆ ಇಲ್ಲ ಹೇಳುವುದಕ್ಕಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಎಲ್ಲವನ್ನೂ ಒಂದೇ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಕಷ್ಟ ಸಾಧ್ಯವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ, ಒಂದು ವೇಳೆ ಮಾಡಿದರೂ ಕೂಡ ಬಾಲಕೃಷ್ಣ ಗೌಡರಂಥವರು ನೂರೆಂಟು ತಪ್ಪುಗಳನ್ನು ಕಂಡುಹಿಡಿಯುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶ ವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಡಿ. ರಾಜಗೋಪಾಲ್.—ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ನಾನು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಾ ಇದ್ದುದನ್ನು ಸರಿಯಾಗಿ ಅರ್ಥಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದರೆ ಈ ಒಂದು ವಿವರಣೆಯನ್ನು ಕೊಡಬೇಕಾದ ಅವಶ್ಯಕತೆ ಇರಲಿಲ್ಲ. ಇತ್ತೀಚೆಗೆ ಬೇರೆ ಬೇರೆ ಪ್ರದೇಶಗಳಲ್ಲಿದ್ದ ಕೆಲವು ಕಾನೂನುಗಳನ್ನು ಕ್ರೋಢೀಕರಿಸಿ ಒಂದು ಬಿಲ್‌ನ್ನು ತಂದು ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಪಾಸ್ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದೇವೆ. ಲೇಬರ್ ಲಾಸ್ ಉದಾಹರಣೆಗೆ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳಬಹುದು. ಎಲ್ಲವನ್ನೂ ಕ್ರೋಢೀಕರಿಸಿ ಒಂದು ಕಾನೂನನ್ನು ಮಾಡಿ ಇಂತಿಂಥ ಕಲಂಗಳು ಇಂತಿಂಥ ಪ್ರದೇಶಗಳಿಗೆ ಅನ್ವಯವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಬಹುದು. ಅದೇನೂ ಒಂದು ಮಹತ್ಕಾರ್ಯವಲ್ಲ, ಚಂದ್ರಲೋಕಕ್ಕೆ ಹೋಗಬೇಕಾದ್ದೂ ಇಲ್ಲ. ಆ ರೀತಿ ಮಾಡದೇ ಇನ್ನೂ ಕೂಡ ನಾವು ಹೈದ್ರಾಬಾದಿನವರು, ನಾವು ಬೊಂಬಾಯಿನವರು, ನಾವು ಗುಲ್ಬರ್ಗಾದವರು ಅಂತ ಹೇಳಬೇಕಾದ ಪ್ರಮೇಯ ಇದೆ. ಇದನ್ನೆಲ್ಲಾ ಸರಿಪಡಿಸಬೇಕೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿ, ಆಡಳಿತಕ್ಕೆ ಅನುಕೂಲವಾಗುವ ಹಾಗೆ 3 ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಗಳನ್ನು ತಂದಿದ್ದಾರೆ, ಇದು ಕ್ಲಿಷ್ಟವಾದ ಕಾನೂನೆಲ್ಲ ಪಾಸ್ ಮಾಡಬಹುದು ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ.

† Smt. M. R. LAKSHAMMA (Graduates' Constituency).—Sir, I would like to offer a few comments on the Hyderabad Jagirs (Commutation) Regulation (Mysore Amendment) Bill, 1969.

Sir, we all know that Hyderabad, originally the domain of Nawabs, was a conglomeration of very many Jagirs and these Jagirs had to be later on adjusted so as to fit in the Republic of India and conform to the Socialistic pattern. Accordingly, certain changes have taken place and the Jagir Administrator seems to have been appointed and he gave various awards in respect of various kinds of Jagirs taking into consideration various arrears like hissa, sarkar, chowth, Makasa, dharpatti and other dues. I do not want to go into these. As was expressed by the hon. Member Sri Anjanappa, we are ignorant of the origin of Jagirs.

But one point I want to raise on this occasion, continuing the arguments of hon. Member Dr. Bandi Gowda, I would reiterare that while revising the order of the Jagir Administrator, the Government of course, should have a right of appeal but the Government should have the right of appeal within a certain number of years; it should not have unlimited right of appeal. After the Jagirdar expends money for his various expenditures and has no other means of paying this sum, the Government should not come in and demand the excess of money that was paid to the Jagirdar or his successor; it would be a hardship. We all have passed in this House Acts validating invalidation of various Acts. That is to say, Government itself want certain amounts which were due to them rightly or wrongly; and we have seen that bills relating to the validation of certain levy and collection of tax have been passed so that those collected amounts could accrue to the Government, though it was held by the High Court that such payments were not regular. Then the Legislature came to the help of the Government and saw to it that these amounts were credited to the Government. In other words, the Government does not want to lose the money that is due to the Government. There should not be double standards in the case of the Government as well as the subject. The praja should have the same privileges as the Government there should be no double standards. So the Jagirdar also should not be made to pay monies much later when he is not in a position to pay and when he has expended long ago the various monies that were given to him, not at his instance, but by the award of the Jagir Administrator. I would like to request the Government to view this matter sympathetically.

In respect of the other payments of Rs. 25 in the case of various persons, whose list is given in the Table below the proposed new Section 10 (A), it is said :

" (1) Where the age of the person, whether male or female, was not less than 60 years on the 1st day of April 1960,

(2) Where the age of the person was less than 60 years on the 1st day of April, 1960

(i) in the case of a male, or an unmarried woman, if the person is incapable of earning a livelihood on account of being blind, deaf, dumb and mute, mentally deranged or crippled or paralytic.

From the 1st April 1960, till the date of the death of the person.

In these hard cases, I think the Government will see to it that this payment of Rs. 25 per mensem is not only expedited but the cases are considered sympathetically and not rigidly according to certain rules because humanity is much more important and humane attitude is much more fitting from a Government of the nature of Mysore than rigid adherence to rules.

With these few words, I welcome this amendment and I hope it will conform to one uniform pattern.

SRI H. V. KOUJALGI.—Since the House has been pleased to accept the amendment except for one suggestion that a comprehensive Bill ought to have been brought, I have not much to reply. Since the existing laws are different in different areas, it was found difficult to bring a uniform Bill.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN.—The question is:

"That the Hyderabad Jagirs (Commutation) Regulation (Mysore Amendment) Bill, 1967, as passed by the Legislative Assembly, be taken into consideration."

The motion was adopted.

V-,32'N69
N70-42-8-16
(B) 5093

CLAUSES

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN.—The question is:

"That clauses 2 to 8, both inclusive do stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clauses 2 to 8, both inclusive, were added to the Bill.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN.—The question is:

That clause 1, the long title and Enacting formula do stand part of the Bill.

The motion was adopted.

Clause 1, the long title and Enacting formula were added to the Bill.

Motion to pass

Sri H. V. KOUJALGI.—I move :

"That the Hyderabad Jagirs (Commutation) Regulation (Mysore Amendment) Bill 1967, as passed by the Ligislative Assembly, be passed."

Mr. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN.—The question is :

"That the Hyderabad Jagirs (Commutation) Regulation (Mysore Amendment) Bill, I967, as passed by the Legislative Assembly' be passed.

The motion was adopted.

Mysore Inams Abolition Laws (Amendment) Bill 1968 (as passed by the Legislative Assembly)

Motion to consider.

Sri H. V. KOUJALGI.—I move :

"That the Mysore Inams Abolition Laws (Amendment) Bill, 1968, as passed by the Legislative Assembly, be taken into consideration."

Mr. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN.—Motion moved :

"That the Mysore Inams Abolition Laws (Amendment) Bill 1968, as passed by the Legislative Assembly, be taken into consideration."

Sri H. V. KOUJALGI.—In Mysore State there are some Acts abolishing the inams—Psrsonal and Miscellaneous Abolition of Inams Act No. 1 of 1955 and also Abolition of Religious and Charitable Inams Abolition Act 18 of 1955. In these two Acts, during implementation some difficulties have been experienced and therefore the amendment is brought forward. The amendments in these two Acts are one and the same. That is why the amendments, though they concern two Acts, are brought in one and the same Bill.

In Clause 1 of the Act I of 1955, it may be noted that in Mysore and other districts there are 60,000 minor inam holdings. It is rather difficult to mention them all in the Bill. So, we have provided that all these inams should be enumerated in a separate notification and that should be treated as a part of this Bill. It is only for the sake of convenience this has been done. So it is proposed to amend the section suitably.

Sub-section 2 of Section 10 of the Act provides for settling th rights of occupation. The amendment provides for making application